

252 IMPOSSIBILITY OF PREVENTING WAR

not be lessened but magnified. For the negotiations concerning the degree of disarmament, the distrust as to whether this were being honourably carried out, mutual recriminations concerning evasions, disputes as to what constitutes equipment, would bring about irritation and arouse the passions which would hinder the course of the calm, diplomatic consideration of the questions. The number of pretexts for war and of causes of war would not be lessened but increased, the tension between the Powers not modified but strengthened.

This is the most serious point of the whole movement in favour of peace. Will this, as so often occurs in unskilful politics, only effect the contrary of what it is striving to bring about, and while preaching peace, only loosen the sword in the scabbard so that it may the more easily be drawn? Will it only precipitate us into the great World-war which might otherwise possibly be averted?

That this will be the logical result of peace movement, must be asserted with absolute decision, in order that no terrible disaster should result from well-intended exertions. If the peace movement were to restrict itself to an agitation in favour of international arbitration courts, it would be fairly harmless. But to the more or less theoretical demand for arbitration has been attached the practical plan of disarmament, and it is in the illusion that disarmament means peace that the danger lies. There is only one single cause that could keep war in the future from us, namely, the recognition that nothing is to be gained thereby; and it is Bloch's distinct merit to have been the first to point this out, in so far as it is correct, unequivocally and upon a technical basis. It is amazing that the author should not have noticed into what contradictions he has been led when he added the demand for disarmament. It is he, indeed, who has taught us that it is just the quantitative and qualitative rise of the power of war